



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
NOVEMBER 6, 2003
APPROVED MINUTES**

PRESENT: Robert Littlefield, Council Member
E.L. Cortez, Vice Chairman
David Barnett, Planning Commission Member
Michael D'Andrea, Design Member
Anne Gale, Design Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

ABSENT: Jeremy Jones, Design Member

STAFF: Tim Curtis
Randy Grant
Jayna Shewak
Curtis Kozall
Bill Verschuren
Al Ward
Greg Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilman Littlefield at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

MINUTES APPROVAL

October 23, 2003 DRB Minutes

APPROVED 11-20-03

MR. BARNETT MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 23, 2003 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 16-PP-2003 | Mirabel Village 8 Preliminary Plat
South of Lone Mountain Pkwy. Between
standing stones & Joy Ranch Roads
Vita, Architect/Designer |
| 67-DR-1999#3 | Whisper Rock Golf Maintenance Facility
Site plan & elevations
32120 N. Whisper Rock Trail
Douglas Fredrikson Architects,
Architect/Designer |
| 53-DR-2003 | Whisper rock Golf Cottages 1
Site Plan, Landscape Plan, & Elevations
32120 N. Whisper Rock Trail
Douglas Fredrikson Architects,
Architect/Designer |
| 59-DR-2001#2 | Acme Bar & Grill Renovation
Site Plan & Elevations
4245 N. Craftsman Ct
Sixty First Place Architects, Architect/Designer |
| 73-DR-1990#2 | Bank U S A Plaza
Exterior Color & Finish/Veneers
4253 N Scottsdale Rd
Sam West, Architect, Architect/Designer |
| 8-MS-2003 | Mountainside Plaza Master Sign Program
Site plan & elevations for signs
NEC Shea Blvd & 116 th Street
Summit West Signs, Applicant |
| 9-MS-2003 | Northsight Crossing
Site Plan & Elevations for Signs
15005 N. Northsight Boulevard
Perlman Architects, Architect/Designer |

MR. BARNETT MOVED TO APPROVE CASES 16-PP-2003, 67-DR-1999#3, 53-DR-2003, 59-DR-2003, 59-DR-2001#2, 73-DR-1990#2, 8-MS-2003 AND 9-MS-2003. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

55-DR-2003 **Northsight Retail & AutoZone**
Site Plan & Elevations
14760 N. Northsight Boulevard
RHL Design Group, Architect/Designer

COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD stated case 55-DR-2003 has been continued.

66-DR-2003 **Offices at McDowell Mountain Ranch Parcel R**
Site Plan & Elevations
16700 N Thompson Peak Parkway
City Spaces, Architect/Designer

MR. VERSCHUREN presented this case as per the project coordination packet. Staff recommends approval, subject to the attached stipulations.

LYNNE LEGARDE, 3101 N. Central, Phoenix, AZ, provided background information on this property. She remarked the staff report states that the strong building presence on major streets that lessened the frontal impacts of the parking and encouraged pedestrian activity. The parking is on the west side of the site. There was notice of the future use of this property. She further remarked this proposal was reviewed and approved by the Design Review Committee of the McDowell Mountain Ranch and their full Board. She discussed the outreach that was done with the neighbors. She discussed the revised stipulations. She showed pictures of the wall situation and how it would be landscaped. She reported they believe by adding a six foot wall with landscaping on the neighbors side they are visually opening those town home back yards making them appear larger and then making sure with the six foot wall that they screen all views. She noted adequate parking is essential to small office projects. She concluded they would request approval.

MR. D'ANDREA inquired if the units had balconies on the second story units. Ms. Legarde replied in the affirmative. Mr. D'Andrea noted their line of sight would be different. Ms. Legarde replied in the affirmative. Mr. D' Andrea stated he thought the trees should be mature enough or dense enough that the people on the upper level are visually impaired from the parking. Ms. Legarde stated that is stipulated.

MR. BARNETT inquired if the Developer was going to take down the wall and move the wall back in front of the cars. Ms. Legarde stated they offered to do that and in order to do that the association would have to agree. If the community decides they want it taken down, they would fund it.

COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD stated if they were to approve this today and decide to leave the wall then they would have the 42-inch wall, landscaping, and the 72-inch wall. Ms. Legarde replied in the affirmative noting that in some places the wall is 36 inches.

MR. D'ANDREA inquired about what the neighbors would see on their side. Ms. Legarde stated the walls will match the color and finish of the abutting condominiums.

MR. SCHMITT stated his concern is that the wall is too far on the property and he would like to see it slid back to the west a little and have some opportunity for planting on the east side as well.

MICHAEL LEARY stated that what they are showing today are all minimums. They are hoping in final engineering to make that number larger. They are hoping to do some massaging of the building footprint to rotate the building closer to Thompson Peak and gain a foot or two.

(COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

ROBERT SOUTHERLAND, 16600 N. Thompson Peak Unit 1003, spoke in opposition to this request. He stated the applicant has made statements that the parking was always along that wall. The original plans show that the parking was along that wall but it was never as close and as tight. He noted he felt the height and the pad of the building could be reduced. He reported that he did not think the proposed placement of the buildings are sensitive to the residents on the western border. The parking is too close to their residences. He expressed his concern that the building is graded four feet below and the vehicle lights would be seen in their homes. He noted the covered parking shelters troubled him because they do not fit the residential scale and character. He provided information on the meeting that was setup with the homeowners, developer, and staff to discuss their issues. He discussed his concern regarding the 19 parking spaces that he felt were not needed. He reported city staff advised him that only a 30-foot setback was required from Thompson Peak as opposed to the 50 feet being proposed. He discussed all of his concerns regarding this project. He commented that they have an appeal of this project to the McDowell Mountain Ranch HOA, they were surprised by the overhead parking stall sheds, and they agreed to review this plan again at their next meeting. He concluded that he felt the applicant has not been sensitive to the surrounding area.

JOHN SIAVELIS, 1660 N. Thompson Peak, Unit 1002, spoke in opposition to this request. He stated he was first advised of this project from a letter dated August 25, 2003. He further stated that he was greatly surprised at the obvious contradictions with regards to being sensitive to the surrounding residential area with the proposed plan. The plan was developed without any input from the most immediate affected residential area and this plan obliterates their quiet enjoyment of their homes. He reported that he felt the parking lot is extensive with cars parking within a few feet of their back doors with parking lights shining into their homes, constant traffic noise only a short distance from their beds. He inquired what happened to the Scottsdale Sensitive Design Principles. He noted that they were advised that the setback should be 30 feet. He further noted the neighborhood meeting was called on short notice and the timing was not convenient for the neighbors.

(COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD requested information on the setback requirements. Mr. Verschuren stated during the zoning case it was stipulated to have a 30-foot setback. There was also a stipulation for placement of the buildings farther away from Thompson Peak Parkway in response to the concerns from the neighbors in that area. He further stated the other thing is that they are looking for consistency with what is (already) out there.

MR. BARNETT stated he would be supporting this project. He further stated that he thought this solution works for all the people concerned. It is a great looking project.

MR. D'ANDREA inquired if there was a wash running through the site and that was why the parking on the southeast corner is held out so far. Ms. Legarde replied in the affirmative. She noted that the 50-foot setback is consistent with what is going on in that area. She further noted that they have been very responsive to understanding and addressing the neighbors concerns.

Mr. D'Andrea stated he would agree with Mr. Barnett that this is a nice project. He further stated he would like them to revisit other options they can do along their wall.

MR. SCHMITT inquired, regarding the 50-foot setback on Thompson Peak Parkway, what would be the issue with taking the development as designed and sliding it back, a few feet toward Thompson Peak Parkway so they do get some buffer. He stated he felt the wall solution in the back, while it is a generous gesture, does not solve all of the problem, noting he had some issues with the landscaping on the development side of that. Ms. Legarde stated typically commercial use setbacks are greater. Mr. Leary discussed the drainage constraints that keep them from moving that building.

MS. GALE inquired if this project would fail if they lost four parking spaces. Mr. Leary replied in the negative. The question he would ask back is what would be gained by losing spaces that you cannot see. Ms. Gale stated she believed they could make a better solution for the neighbors if they took out more parking spaces on the back wall and planted four specimen trees so they would have a layered greenery issue. When they are on their balconies, they would see trees. Mr. Leary stated that he did not know if you could selectively take out four spaces and effectively achieve a lot. Ms. Gale replied she thought they could that it would mitigate the look of the very stark wall if there were trees. Mr. Leary stated they would see the trees over the wall. Ms. Gale stated she would like them to consider this idea for more than a moment because she felt it was a very good idea. Mr. Leary stated his gut is telling him in the final plans they would see a larger area but he could not commit to that.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired with regard to the HOA on the west, how long would it take them to approve or deny the removal of the existing site wall. Ms. Legarde stated she did not think anyone could speculate on that. That is why they tried to come up with a solution giving the ultimate choice to the neighbors. She reiterated they have offered to fund it if it is approved.

Vice Chairman Cortez stated based on everything he has heard today from the applicant and the homeowners they are very close to resolving the problem. The homeowners want a green belt and one way to achieve that is by removing that existing wall and the developer is willing to remove the wall and provide additional landscaping on their property. They also are increasing the height of their wall that would eliminate any headlights on their residences. The applicant has stipulated to no pole mounted site lighting noting that does not happen very often. He concluded he felt the applicant has done a tremendous job in trying to alleviate the concerns of the neighbors.

MR. SCHMITT inquired if staff supports the solution proposed with the six wall added into the property and not removing the existing wall that would create a no mans land between the two walls. Mr. Verschuren replied they would be comfortable.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 66-DR-2003 WITH THE AMENDED STIPULATIONS AND THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL STIPULATION:

THE FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN IS BROUGHT BACK TO THE BOARD FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL PARTICULARLY NOTING THE CONCERNS ON THE WESTERN BOUNDARY OF THE PROPERTY.

SECOND BY MR. D'ANDREA.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

MR. VERSCHUREN stated for clarification is it back for a hearing or for a study session? Vice Chairman Cortez replied a hearing.

MR. BARNETT stated for clarification he thought what they were doing a yes or no on the project and if they are coming back with the landscaping plan it would seem as if they are slowing down the project rather than coming up with a solution. Vice Chairman Cortez stated he believed with this approval they are permitted to proceed with site development and the building plans and all they are asking because of the concerns and issues discussed today with regard to the western boundary landscape on the site will be brought back for review. Councilman Littlefield noted that is the way they just passed it.

MS. LEGARDE inquired how quickly they can come back because they have a closing and financing issue and this does not give them the final approval if they have to come back with the landscape plan. Councilman Littlefield stated the way he understood the motion was they approved everything except the landscaping plan. Ms. Legarde inquired if they were looking for the final engineered landscape plan. Vice Chairman Cortez replied his intent was to have the final engineered landscape plan. Mr. Leary stated they want to see if they would be able to push the landscaping and they won't know that until they go into final engineering and they can't go into final engineering until they purchase the property. Councilman Littlefield stated they have the approval for everything except for the landscaping.

70-DR-2003

Hacienda d'Mexico Office/Warehouse
Site Plan & Elevations
16098 N. 80th Street
Architects & Planners Int'l/Architects

MR. GRANT presented this case as per the project coordination packet. He stated staff is proposing the addition of the following stipulation:

Access to Greenway Hayden Loop shall be emergency access only. The driveway on the site plan shall be modified to reflect emergency access only.

Staff recommends approval subject to the attached and proposed stipulations.

COUNCILMAN LITTLEFIELD inquired how they would limit that entrance to emergency access only. Mr. Grant stated they would propose to take out the driveway and put in some type of compacted granite that would not obviously be a way in or out of the site but that trucks could use.

MR. D'ANDREA stated along the Greenway Hayden loop further south there is a lot of industrial looking furniture stores that put things out for display to draw people into the building. He further stated he felt with a combination of the aesthetics of this building and the stipulation that does not allow for any exterior displays they are missing a wonderful opportunity to display things and draw people into the building. He reported he felt the driveway would be used by a lot of people. Mr. Grant stated the zoning restricts sales. He further stated this would not be a retail facility but a distribution point for their corporate retail stores.

VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ inquired where the underground storage facility would be located. Mr. Grant provided information on where the underground storage facility would be located.

MR. BARNETT MOVED TO APPROVE CASE 70-DR-2003 WITH THE ADDITION OF THE STIPULATION MR. GRANT PRESENTED. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN CORTEZ.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

"For the Record" Court Reporters